

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-50 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 19-24

Claims 19, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0114181 (Lee et al., hereinafter referred to as Lee) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0090934 (Cha et al., hereinafter referred to as Cha). Claims 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0117553 (Wang et al., hereinafter referred to as Wang).

Claim 19 recites a method of providing high speed downlink packet access (HSDPA) services. The method comprises receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, the method comprises transmitting at least one feedback signal indicating the results of measurements of the power of at least one of the allocated timeslots during a predetermined time period.

Lee discloses a method for transmitting power control information for high speed downlink shared channel (HS-SCCH) in a universal mobile telecommunication system (UMTS). The Examiner asserts that Lee discloses receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed

HSDPA transmit power level, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. The Applicants strongly disagree. Lee discloses determining a power offset (PO) value for an HS-SCCH (relative to a dedicated physical channel (DPCH), and transmitting the PO value. Lee fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Clearly, a PO value indicates an amount by which an existing power level should be changed, and does not indicate a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The Examiner fails to show where Lee teaches the limitations of the claim as indicated by the underlined text above.

Cha discloses distributed call control. Cha fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Cha fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot.

Claims 20 and 21 are dependent upon claim 19, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Claim 22 recites a base station comprising a receiver and a transmitter that perform the same functions as recited in claim 19. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 22 is allowable for the same reasons provided above. Furthermore, the Applicants note that the Examiner fails to indicate in the Office Action where the cited references teach or suggest the receiver and the transmitter in the base station of claim 22.

Claims 23 and 24 are dependent upon claim 22, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-34

Claims 25, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Cha, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0097253 (Malkamaki) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210660 (Wiberg et al., hereinafter referred to as Wiberg). Claims 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of Wang. Claims 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0083977 (Moulsley et al., hereinafter referred to as Moulsley). **[It is noted that the rejections of claims 26, 28, 31 and 33 must also require the teachings of Malkamaki and Wiberg, since they were used to reject the independent claims 25 and 30.]**

Claim 25 recites a method of providing high speed downlink packet access (HSDPA) services. The method comprises receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a

plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, the method comprises transmitting at least one feedback signal indicating the results of measurements of the power of at least one of the allocated TTIs during a predetermined time period.

Lee discloses a method for transmitting power control information for high speed downlink shared channel (HS-SCCH) in a universal mobile telecommunication system (UMTS). The Examiner asserts that Lee discloses receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The Applicants strongly disagree. Lee discloses determining a power offset (PO) value for an HS-SCCH (relative to a dedicated physical channel (DPCH), and transmitting the PO value. Lee fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Clearly, a PO value indicates an amount by which an existing power level should be changed, and does not indicate a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The Examiner fails to show where Lee teaches the limitations of the claim as indicated by the underlined text above.

Cha discloses distributed call control. Cha fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not

allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Cha fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Malkamaki discloses transmissions in a communication system. Malkamaki fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Malkamaki fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Wiberg discloses radio resource management for a high speed shared channel. Wiberg fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Wiberg fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the

HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Claims 26-29 are dependent upon claim 25, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Claim 30 recites a base station comprising a receiver and a transmitter that perform the same steps as recited in claim 25. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 30 is allowable for the same reasons provided above. Furthermore, the Applicants note that the Examiner failed to indicate where the cited references teach or suggest the receiver and the transmitter in the base station of claim 30.

Claims 31-34 are dependent upon claim 30, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 25-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 35-40

Claims 35, 37, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Cha. Claims 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of Wang.

Claim 35 recites a method of providing high speed downlink packet access (HSDPA) services. The method comprises transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, the method comprises receiving at least one feedback signal

indicating the results of measurements of the power of at least one of the allocated timeslots during a predetermined time period.

Lee discloses a method for transmitting power control information for high speed downlink shared channel (HS-SCCH) in a universal mobile telecommunication system (UMTS). The Examiner asserts that Lee discloses receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. The Applicants strongly disagree. Lee discloses determining a power offset (PO) value for an HS-SCCH (relative to a dedicated physical channel (DPCH), and transmitting the PO value. Lee fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Clearly, a PO value indicates an amount by which an existing power level should be changed, and does not indicate a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The Examiner fails to show where Lee teaches the limitations of the claim as indicated by the underlined text above.

Cha discloses distributed call control. Cha fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Cha fails to teach or suggest

receiving at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot.

Claims 36 and 37 are dependent upon claim 35, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Claim 38 recites a radio network controller (RNC) comprising a transmitter and a receiver that perform the same functions as recited in claim 35. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 38 is allowable for the same reasons provided above. Furthermore, the Applicants note that the Examiner fails to indicate in the Office Action where the cited references teach or suggest the transmitter and the receiver in the RNC of claim 38.

Claims 39 and 40 are dependent upon claim 38, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 41-50

Claims 41, 43, 45, 46, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Cha, Malkamaki and Wiberg. Claims 42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of Wang. Claims 44 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Cha, and further in view of Mousley. **[It is noted that the rejections of claims 42, 44, 47 and 49 must also require the teachings of**

Malkamaki and Wiberg, since they were used to reject the independent claims 41 and 46.]

Claim 41 recites a method of providing high speed downlink packet access (HSDPA) services. The method comprises transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, the method comprises receiving at least one feedback signal indicating the results of measurements of the power of at least one of the allocated TTIs during a predetermined time period.

Lee discloses a method for transmitting power control information for high speed downlink shared channel (HS-SCCH) in a universal mobile telecommunication system (UMTS). The Examiner asserts that Lee discloses receiving at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The Applicants strongly disagree. Lee discloses determining a power offset (PO) value for an HS-SCCH (relative to a dedicated physical channel (DPCH), and transmitting the PO value. Lee fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Clearly, a PO value indicates an amount by which an existing power level should be changed, and does not indicate a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level. The

Examiner fails to show where Lee teaches the limitations of the claim as indicated by the underlined text above.

Cha discloses distributed call control. Cha fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of timeslots allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated timeslot is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Cha fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Malkamaki discloses transmissions in a communication system. Malkamaki fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Malkamaki fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Wiberg discloses radio resource management for a high speed shared channel. Wiberg fails to teach or suggest transmitting at least one control signal

indicating at least one maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level and a plurality of transmission timing intervals (TTIs) allocated for the usage of HSDPA channels, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of each allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated timeslot. Furthermore, Wiberg fails to teach or suggest receiving at least one feedback signal that indicates the results of measurements of the power of at least one allocated timeslot that is indicated by a control signal, wherein the HSDPA transmit power level of the allocated TTI is not allowed to exceed a maximum allowed HSDPA transmit power level indicated for the allocated TTI.

Claims 42-45 are dependent upon claim 41, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Claim 46 recites a radio network controller (RNC) comprising a transmitter and a receiver that perform the same functions as recited in claim 41. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 46 is allowable for the same reasons provided above. Furthermore, the Applicants note that the Examiner failed to indicate where the cited references teach or suggest the transmitter and the receiver in the RNC of claim 46.

Claims 47-50 are dependent upon claim 46, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 41-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this


Applicant: Rudolf et al.
Application No.: 10/806,502

application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 19-50, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf et al.

By 
Scott Wolinsky
Registration No. 46,413

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

SW/bbf/yil